



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/300,042	04/27/1999	GREGORY B. THAGARD	3054/8	4009

22440 7590 10/08/2002

GOTTLIEB RACKMAN & REISMAN PC  
270 MADISON AVENUE  
8TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 100160601

EXAMINER

CHOW, DOON Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2675

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/300,042

Applicant(s)

THAGARD ET AL.

Examiner

Dennis-Doon Chow

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 31-34, 36-49 and 51-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 31-34, 36-49 and 51-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 31-34, 36-49, and 51-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitch (5912653) in view of Levin (4601120) and Shanks et al. (5747928).

Fitch discloses an apparel for a wearer comprising: jacket; a flexible electronic display (abstract) associated with the jacket, wherein the display being an LED display (Fig. 7); a memory; a control member; selection member; and an input means.

Fitch does not explicitly disclose the use of a fabric panel.

Levin, in the same display field, discloses a wearable and flexible display device comprising a fabric panel, wherein the wearable display device obviously can be attached to any garment such as a shirt, a vest, a hat or a belt.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Levin's concept in Fitch's invention because it is known to mounting a flexible display on a fabric panel.

Fitch does not disclose the LED display being a light-emitting polymer. However, using a light emitting polymer as a flexible display is well known in the art shown by Shanks. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the known light emitting polymer in the invention of Fitch.

Art Unit: 2675

3. Claims ~~60~~ and ~~61~~ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitch in view of Shanks.

Fitch discloses an apparel for a wearer comprising: jacket; a flexible electronic display (abstract) associated with the jacket, wherein the display being an LED display (Fig. 7); a memory; a control member; selection member; and an input means.

Fitch does not disclose the LED display being a light emitting polymer. However, using a light emitting polymer as a flexible display is well known in the art shown by Shanks. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the known light emitting polymer in the invention of Fitch.

4. Claims 31, 33-34, 49, 56, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levin in view of Shanks et al.

Levin discloses an apparel for a wearer comprising: a flexible LED display, and a fabric panel.

Levin does not disclose the LED display being a light emitting polymer. However, using a light emitting polymer as a flexible display is well known in the art shown by Shanks. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the known light emitting polymer in the invention of Levin.

5. Claims 62-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brucker et al in view of Fitch and Shanks et al.

Brucker discloses apparatus for playing a war game comprising: a garment; an electronic display (indicator) form on the garment; a controller; a gun; and a sensor.

Brucker does not explicitly disclose the display being able to display images.

Fitch discloses a wearable and flexible display device being able to display a plurality of images.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to Fitch's concept in Brucker's invention because Fitch's display device allows the apparatus to display a detail image.

Fitch does not disclose the LED display being a light emitting polymer. However, using a light emitting polymer as a flexible display is well known in the art shown by Shanks. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the known light emitting polymer in Fitch's display in Brucker's invention.

6. Claims 62-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerber (5788500) in view of Shanks.

Gerber discloses apparatus for playing a war game comprising: a garment; an electronic display for displaying an image; a controller; a gun; and a sensor.

Gerber does not disclose the display being a light emitting polymer. However, using a light emitting polymer as a display is well known in the art shown by Shanks. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the known light emitting polymer in the invention of Shanks.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed July 8, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Fitch utilizes an LCD screen which is clearly a stiff material. The examiner disagrees because Fitch not only disclose a flexible LCD screen, he also discloses the screen is an LED screen (see Fig. 7)

As to applicant's argument with regarding to combine references, it is not necessary that the references actually suggest, expressly or in so many words, the changes or improvements that applicant has made. The test for combining references is what the references as a whole would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

### ***Conclusion***


Art Unit: 2675

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis-Doon Chow whose telephone number is 703-305-4398. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00, Alternate Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Saras can be reached on 703-305-9720. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

D. Chow  
October 2, 2002

  
DENNIS-DOON CHOW  
EXAMINER